



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,903	11/02/2005	Heinz-Willi Greuel	GREUEL	2327
25880 7590 06/11/2008 COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD ROSLYN, NY 11576				
EXAMINER				
ADDRESSEE, SARA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3724				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/11/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/531,903

Applicant(s)

GREUEL ET AL.

Examiner

SARA ADDISU

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/7/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-42 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 April 0105 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/2/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- Applicant's election with traverse of Claims 1-7 in the reply filed on 3/7/08 is acknowledged.
- Claims 8-42 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected Group II, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

In response to Applicants arguments that "As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully submit that there is sufficient relationship and unity of the claims as to warrant their examination in one application as claim 11 depends on claim 1, and claims 1 and 8 are directed to the identical inventive idea to use an essentially planar slide bearing", Examiner respectfully points out although claim 11 depends from claim 1, claim 11 claims the machining tool as well whereby it specifically claims "a peeling machine, for machining long work pieces". The radially adjustable tool holder of claim 1, is not limited to peeling machines, i.e. it can be used for example of boring the inside of a workpiece, chamfering pipes, or side milling cutters (see SU 1720811A1). Regarding groups I and II, Examiner respectfully points out that an adjusting device for a tool holder (claimed in claim 1) does not require an adjusting ring having a conically configuration inside as the adjusting device for the tool head to be adjusted radially(for example to

adjust the radial position of said tool mounting, one can use adjusting devices such as screw means, piston shaft or sliding block having wedge parts/dovetail arrangement).

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 11/2/05 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because

- US 2001/039861 should be US 2001/0039861 and
- US 4,298,430 should be US 4,289,430

It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ostertag (USP 6,711,976).

OSTERTAG teaches a tool head having tool holders (10) that are adjustable essentially radially to an axis of rotation (16'); and a truncated cone shaped adjusting device (12) that is adjustable essentially axially to the axis of rotation, in which device the tool holders and the adjusting device correspond with one another by way of slide surfaces, wherein the slide surfaces have a constant radius of curvature parallel to the axis of rotation ('976, figure 1 and 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ostertag (USP 6,711,976), in view of Campbell (USP 6,190,050).

OSTERTAG teaches a tool head having tool holders (10) that are adjustable essentially radially to an axis of rotation (16'), as set forth in the above rejection. Regarding claim 5, it is old and well known in the machining environment to include a bushing for linear movement toward and away from two parts.

However, OSTERTAG fails to teach the slide surface having an inlay.

CAMPBELL teaches replaceable grid pattern of wear-resistant material strips (inlay) being established for a radial bearing or bushing (100) ('050, col. 1, lines 12-16 & col. 5, lines 1-11 and figures 8-9A). Regarding claim 3, CAMPBELL discloses the claimed invention (i.e. an inlay) except for the material of the inlay being metal. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to choose any material for the inlay depending on the strength/hardness desired for the application, because it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify OSTERTAG such that it included an inlay, as taught by CAMPBELL for the purpose of lengthening the life of the surfaces that are sliding against each other ('050, col. 1, lines 31-43).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara Addisu at (571) 272-6082. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on (571) 272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Sara Addisu/
Examiner, Art Unit 3722
6/8/08

/Boyer D. Ashley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3724